## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

FILED

2008 HAR 10 AM 10: 05

FROM: R. Mull CASE NO.: 08 CASE TITLE: 0 DOCUMENT EN	STRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE  in, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE:  cv0423 L (RBB) DOCUMENT FILED BY:  Chadwick v. San Diego Police Department  TITLED: Supplemental Letters to Complaint  e submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:
✓ Local Rule	Discrepancy
5.1 5.3 5.4 7.1 or 47.1 7.1 or 47.1 7.1 or 47.1 15.1 30.1 X	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper  Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.  Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions  Missing table of contents  Amended pleading not complete in itself Depositions not accepted absent a court order  Supplemental documents require court order  Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest  OTHER:
	Date forwarded: 3/6/2008
IT <i>J</i> S HEREBY O	ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE RDERED:
The docume	ent is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
Counsel is a to Local Ru  Dated:  cc: All Part	CHAMBERS OF: Judge Coren 2  By: SHE   PSLC